

RemarksObjections to the Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5). A drawing sheet labeled as a "replacement sheet" in accordance with the Examiner's instructions is included with this office action response. Additionally, formal drawings have been included based upon the informal drawings submitted with the application filing. Therefore, the Applicants believe the objection to the drawings has been overcome and respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the drawings.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected claims 8 and 14-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Applicants have amended claims 8 and 14-19 to replace "YCaCb" with "YCrCb". Support for this amendment can be found in Fig. 4B in which in association with "CSC\_Ca" it is disclosed that "NOTE: Called Cb in CrCb notation" and in which association with "CSC\_Cb" it is disclosed that "NOTE: Called Cr in CrCb notation". Therefore, according to this notation convention disclosed in the original application, YCaCb was defined as equivalent to YCrCb. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claims 8 and 14-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C § 102(b)

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 as anticipated by U.S. patent number 5,465,164 issued to Sugiura et al, hereinafter referred to as Sugiura. The applicants have amended claim 1 to include the limitations of "performing an inverse DCT upon data using processor executable instructions to generate a first result, having a first format including a sign bit, an integer portion, and a fractional portion, in a first color space."

According to MPEP section 2131, "A claim is anticipated only if **each and every element** as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." (emphasis added) Because Sugiura does not disclose all of the limitations of the amended claim 1, the amended claim 1 is not anticipated by

Sugiura. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 2-21 as obvious over Sugiura and various combinations of references consisting of U.S. patent number 5,465,164 issued to Greene, the published article "Fast Algorithms for the Discrete Cosine Transform" (hereinafter referred to as Winograd), U.S. patent number 5,467,131 issued to Bhaskaran et al (hereinafter referred to as Bhaskaran), U.S. patent number 6,304,237 issued to Karakawa, and U.S. patent number 5,465,164 issued to Pan.

Rejections of claims 2-3 and 6-8 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 2-8 incorporate by reference the limitations recited in the amended claim 1 of "performing an inverse DCT upon data using processor executable instructions to generate a first result, having a first format including a sign bit, an integer portion, and a fractional portion, in a first color space" and "converting the first result from the first format to a second format including an integer portion using conversion hardware" The Applicants could not locate teaching in Sugiara, Greene, Bhaskaran, or Winograd that discloses these recited limitations.

According to section 2143.03 of the MPEP, "[t]o establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, **all** the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." (emphasis added). Because it appears none of these references teach or suggest the recited limitations of the amended claim 1, for at least this reason, a valid prima facie obviousness rejection of claims 2-3 and 6-8 is not present. The cancellation of claims 4 and 5 renders the rejection of these claims moot. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2-8.

Rejections of claims 9-10 and 12-15 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The amended claim 9 includes the limitations of "a formatting device arranged to receive decompressed data generated from the execution of processor executable instructions in a first format including a sign bit, an integer portion, and a fractional portion and configured to generate reformatted data from the decompressed data in a second

format including an integer portion.” These limitations of the amended claim 9 are incorporated by reference into dependent claims 10 and 12-15. The Applicants could not locate teaching in Sugiura, Pan, Greene, Winograd, or Karakawa that discloses these recited limitations. Because it appears none of these references teach or suggest the recited limitations of the amended claim 9, for at least this reason, a valid prima facie obviousness rejection of claims 9-10 and 12-15 is not present. The cancellation of claim 11 renders the rejection of this claim moot. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claims 9-15.

Rejections of claims 16-17 and 19 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The amended claim 16 includes the limitations of “a processing device configured to execute instructions to compute an inverse DCT using a Winograd process to generate decompressed YCrCb color space data in a first format including a sign bit, an integer portion, and a fractional portion” and “a converter configured to change the YCrCb color space data from the first format to a second format including an integer portion.” These limitations of the amended claim 16 are incorporated by reference into dependent claims 17 and 19. The Applicants could not locate teaching in Sugiura, Pan, Greene, Winograd, or Karakawa that discloses these recited limitations. Because it appears none of these references teach or suggest the recited limitations of the amended claim 16, for at least this reason, a valid prima facie obviousness rejection of claims 16-17 and 19 is not present. The cancellation of claim 18 renders the rejection of this claim moot. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claims 16-19.

Rejections of claims 20 and 21 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)


The amended claim 20 includes the limitations of “means for executing code to perform an inverse DCT to generate data in a first format including a sign bit, an integer portion, and a fractional portion” and “means for converting the data in the first format to the data in a second format including an integer portion.” The Applicants could not locate teaching in Sugiura, Pan, Winograd, or Karakawa that discloses these recited limitations. Because it appears none of these references teach or suggest the recited limitations of the amended claim 20, for at least this reason, a valid prima facie obviousness rejection

of claim 20 is not present. The cancellation of claim 21 renders the rejection of this claim moot. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claims 20 and 21.

Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully contend that the subject application is in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
Harlan A. Talley, et al.

By   
Gregg W. Wisdom  
Reg. No. 40,231

October 21, 2004  
(360) 212-8052